

REMARKS

Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-23, 25-26, 29-31, 33-34, 37-39, and 45-47 are pending prior to this amendment, with claims 12, 22, 29, and 37 being independent. Claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-23 and 45-47 have been canceled without prejudice. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-17 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Benjamin Lok, "Online model reconstruction for interactive virtual environments," hereinafter Benjamin, and in view of Tuceryan et al. (US 2002/0113756 A1), hereinafter referred to as Tuceryan. Claims 3, 6, 18-19 and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Benjamin, and in view of Tuceryan, and further in view of Rong et al. (US 6,879,946 B2). The rejections of claims 2-10, 12, 13, 15-23 and 45-47 have been obviated by the cancellation of these claims.

Claims 25, 26, 29-31, 33, 34 and 37-39 have been allowed. Therefore, all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is thus respectfully requested.

With regard to the statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, it is recognized that in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 1302.14, the Examiner's reasons for allowance

need not set forth all of the details as to why the claims are allowed. In this application, it is not conceded that the Examiner's stated reasons for allowance are the only reasons for which the claims are allowable. The Examiner's reasons for allowance indicate that particular claim elements are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, yet the claims may be patentable for other reasons as well, including the inventive combination of all of the recited claim elements. It is not conceded that the specific limitations identified by the Examiner are necessary to distinguish the art of record or to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Moreover, the Examiner does not assert, and it would not be conceded, that the Examiner's reasons have any bearing on the patentability of claims in any other applications directed to the disclosed subject matter.

In addition, each dependent claim stands on its own and may be allowable on its own merits. In particular, each dependent claim may be allowable on the basis of a combination of some of the features recited in the dependent claim and its base claim(s), which combination of features may not include all of the limitations identified in the Examiner's reasons for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that issue or comment. Because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

Please apply any necessary charges or credits, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug. 2, 2007

for

Wm. E. Hunter
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

WILLIAM E. HUNTER
REG. NO 47,671

10741466.doc